COMMUNICATIONS.

[The New National Era does not hold itself re

Letter from Mississippi.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

Those of us in the South are grieving to see so much contention between our Republican friends and the dear old leaders of our great party at the North. We have read earnestly the discussions between the New York Tribune, Harper's Weekly, The Golden Age, the NEW NATIONAL ERA, and the Independent during the past year as to the best candidate for the next Presidency. And we cannot conceal the fact that the waters are troubled, and that there may be breakers ahead. In several letters from leading men in the North, and from members of Congress representing Southern States, we were, and are even now, asked: "How stands your State on the Presidency?" There is no doubt of Mississippi being thoroughly Republican, and supporting the Philadelphia nomination, whoever it may be. But we are forced to ask the question, why this division? The name of Charles Sumner is dear to our heart of hearts, and we would prefer to sacrifice any other in the party than him. Cannot something be done to unite the leading men of the party? Schurz, though having done great good for freedom during and since the war, we feel like condemning for his course in the last Missouri campaign. But Sumner, Greeley, Fenton, and those who signed the New York pronunciamento, and others of lesser lights, we certainly cannot afford to lose. Grant has a strong hold on the Republicans of this State on account of his victories here; but the State would go for the party if another were to receive the nomination. We do not mean to unite in the clamor of denouncing Grant. He has certainly fulfilled his promises, especially those made to us, but do these entitle him to renomination at the risk of dividing the dear old party? Would not Ben Wade, Senator Morton, Henry Wilson, Geo. S. Boutwell, Schuyler Colfax, ex-Governor Classin, ex-Governor Hawley, or any of a dozen other old leaders of the party unite it and make it formidable for the next Presidential campaign? We would have named Charles Summer in the above list, but he is so prominent in the opposition fight that we know he would not unite the party. Why persist in nominating Grant? We are not crossing such a rapid stream that another could not take us safely across.

The Independent talks of reading Greeley and others out of the Republican party if they indorse the Cincinnati Convention. We are not much of a disciple of Greeley, but if we are quick in reading some of the founders of the party out of it, we had better take care that we don't read the party itself out of exweek's Golden Age seems to have some weight, viz: If some other good, reliable, strong, and well-known Republican than Grant could be spoken of for the nomination at Philadelphia, the Cincinnati Convention would disband before it meets. If something could be done, without sacrificing one iota of the principle of the party, to unite it, and have all the dear old leaders clasp hands and work shoulder to shoulder during the Presidential campaign, we would give the Democratic party its certain death-blow, and send it hurling down the stream of oblivion. But so long as there is division among our leaders, we will be by our own acts infusing new life into its decaying

in the midst of a terrible war, and it was not dozen of the old leaders of the party could carry on the good work now in progress. Do not understand us as being opposed to Grant. Our only fear is, that the party may be divided by insisting upon his renomination, while another may unite it. We have too much at stake to see division in our ranks, and all we ask is, for some measure to unite all the dif-fering elements. Mississippi may be depended upon, however, for the nominee.

In our last we were rejoicing over the passage of our civil rights bill. But while in the clerk's hands in the Senate, after its passage, and just before going to the Governor for his signature, some contemptible scoundrel stole it, and nothing can be found of it. Mr. Carter, of this county, the originator and the prime mover of the bill, introduced another a week or ten days ago, got it through the House, but in the excitement of the closing hours of the Senate it failed to receive support and was

So we shall have to bear insults and contempt another year. At the next session however, another bill will surely be presented and our friends will watch it more closely. When we wrote to you of the bill abolishing Alcorn University, we were informed by one of our representatives of its passage through the House, and that it would certainly pass the Senate; but it did not succeed. It failed in the Senate, and the University still exists.

WASHINGTON, April 21, 1872. To the Editor of the New National Era:

In your last issue, under your cavea alleging that you do not hold yourself responsible for the views expressed by corre spondents, but that you gladly receive all well written and interesting communications, I notice a letter from D. A. S., which is one of the most malicious and grossest slanders against a most honorable and worthy gentlema

which can be conceived. This writer begins his article by giving very learned and profound definition word "caste," including its etymology, history, and present signification, and then pro ceeds to condemn all caste as "degraded," "loathsome," and "mongrel." These epis tles, when applied to that caste which is founded upon the color of the skin, are eminently proper. I will not allow any one to go further than I do in abhorrence of any rimination which is based upon so un just, petty, and contemptible a criterion. But there is a kind of caste which I favor, and which must exist with all cultivated and enlightened people. I believe in that caste which is based upon intelligence and morality. I believe in the superiority of education over ignorance, of honesty over corrup-tion, of cultivation and refinement over rude-

NEW NATIONAL ERA.

TED NEW NATIONAL SERV

VOL. III.-NO. 16.}

WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1872.

facts, to fix upon an eminent colored citizen go frenzy at the idea of equality-is the great of acknowledged ability, education, and refinement. If this misrepresentation was willful, it was most malignant, and ought to offices, are too often occupied by unfit perbrand its author with the stamp of slander. If the author was not personally cognizant of the facts, but has made the statement upon the assertion of others who have misinformed | What an anomaly! Not entirely so, since him, he is still culpable, and should at least feline like, their dilated pupils can find suffiretract. A man may not blamelessly give cient light in a corner, and much more so credence to idle rumor, and then add confir- upon a hill, to enable them to plunder. I mation and currency to it by publishing it as fact. When a gentleman's reputation may be affected thereby, it is not sufficient that the author hide himself behind so paltry a defense as "I was told it was so," He

While D. A. S. did not name the individual sufficiently definite to make it clear to most. if not to all, to whom he referred. But, in order that I may not be charged with giving the insult greater publicity and definiteness mediate or hearsay evidence, but are derived may say that I know the motives which actuated the gentleman in his conduct, (so far as it is ever possible for one person to understand the motives of another.) But what are the grounds for this invective of D. A. at meals, and at all times-another because S .- which it is not the fault of his intention if they do not rival the Phillippics of Demosthenes. Let us see. This gentleman, while sojourning in this

hould know whereof he speaks.

city, attended one of our largest and finest white churches. This church disavows all prejudice or discrimination on account of olor, and, consequently, it is largely attended by colored people. But this gentleman soon observed (what must be perceived by any one on entering that church) that colored persons seemed always excluded from the more prominent portions of the church, and were invariably confined to the last three or four rows of seats. Beyond a certain point no negroes were permitted to penetrate. The reason assigned for this was that the others were rented pews. But this gentleman did not like this "black belt," which gave every appearance of proscription, and, in order to test the validity of the excuse and the sincerity of the profession of unprejudiced sentiments on the part of the hurch, made application to rent a pew. The new assigned was adjacent to this proscribed ection, however, and, therefore, the question which he had attempted to solve was still dubious and unsettled, although it was said that that was the best pew then unoccupied. Nor istence. A remark Mr. Tilton made in last did subsequent events tend to remove the suspicion that the old negro bate still lived and lingered in that sanctuary. Rented pews had hitherto been regarded as inviolable, if not by white, at least by colored, visitors. The extons had been assiduous in the mainte ance of this rule. But upon entering this gentleman invariably found his pew partially occupied. He cheerfully submitted to this. however, having no objection to allowing vistors to share his pew when there were not enough of his own family or friends to fill it. On one occasion when he required the entire pew he was obliged politely to request some persons to vacate it. But he soon observed that only colored and no white visitors were ever put into his pew; while that, if white persons were, certainly no colored persons were ever placed in any white man's pew. This became so apparent that he decided to we are at peace, and almost any one of a mention it to the pastor. He told the pastor plainly that there appeared to be a decided exhibition of prejudice notwithstanding their professions of Republicanism. He said he was not ungenerous. He would willingly share his pew, when convenient, to strangers, whether white or black. But he objected to any system of proscription. Justice required that he should be put upon the same footing with other pew-holders. He declared that no discrimination should be made in the seection of the strangers who were placed in his pew; that a white man should be placed there as readily as a colored one. And he demanded, further, as a requirement of jus-tice, that colored people should also be placed n white people's pews. The minister claimed to be ignorant of the custom, but said that every pew-holder had a right to object to any one coming into his pew, and that if members refused to allow colored persons in their pews he had no power to compel them to do o. He would, however, he said, on the succeeding Sabbath, publicly request those who objected to receiving strangers in their pews e leave a note to that effect in them, and that he would then specially instruct the

> did make the announcement. And this is the "rebuke" our friend received, as D. A. S. alleges. Why, so far from being a rebuke, it was a furtherance on the part of the pastor of the gentleman's endeavors to break lown the unholy prejudice! But it is needless to comment further. The facts speak for themselves, and no one who has the true interests of the colored race at heart can utter one syllable of reproach; but, on the other hand, must commend and give thanks to the gentleman for his bold and righteous assertion of equal rights. This gentleman, so far from "deserting his race when needed and rushing to ease and luxury," has periled his laboring for the interests of his race and the Republican party in the very heart of the Ku-Klux district in the most dangerous times. The letter of D. A. S. is a poor re turn for such heroic and sacrificing conduct. Indeed D. A. S. would seem to have a mania for rushing into print with onslaughts upon somebody. It makes no difference how unjust the criticism so long as it affords him an opportunity to appear in print. In con-clusion, let me hope that in the future D. A. S., in his anxious zeal to find something to write ahout, will not allow his passion to

sextons to place strangers, regardless of color, in the pews of all those who did not thus

object.

A National School.

A national school, in which all the branch

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 20, 1872. To the Editor of the New National Era:

ness and barbarism; and I can have no respect for him who disregards such distinction.

But it is not my present purpose to disprove your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of truth that I hope to repel the imputation of an unworthy prejudice which D. A. S.

But it is not my present purpose to disprove your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of an unworthy prejudice which D. A. S.

But it is not my present purpose to disprove your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of an unworthy prejudice which D. A. S.

But it is not my present purpose to disprove your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of an unworthy prejudice which D. A. S.

But it is not my present purpose to disprove your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of truth that I hope to repel the imputation of an unworthy prejudice which D. A. S.

But it is not my present purpose to disprove your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of truth that I hope to repel the imputation of an unworthy prejudice which D. A. S.

But it is not my present purpose to disprove your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of the duty imposed secured a market to the duty imposed secured a market to the American manufacturers of glass, they went to work with all their force, each seeking his to-day the dupe of designing hnow-noth-intensity should be Protected.

Mr. Duell commenced his remarks by briefly referring to the sentiment of the American manufacturers of glass, they went to work with all their force, each seeking his to-day the dupe of designing hnow-noth-intensity should be protected.

Mr. Duell commenced his remarks by briefly referring to the sentiment of the American manufacturers of glass, they went to work with all their force, each seeking his to-day the dupe of designing hnow-noth-in need of this Republic. It is no less singular than true that our schools, like our public sons. Men and women entirely unknown. who, from their obscurity, seek light among the sable sons and daughters of our people have found, through personal experience, that the greatest curse which can fall upon an institution of learning, is to connect it with politics, and thus sacrifice its pupils by hecatombs to the avarice of demagogues, whose constant tune is no "longer pipe, no longer dance." We can whom he assailed, yet his description was lay our finger upon such an institution which is a whited sepulchre and full of dead men's bones. In it, there are not six living, loving teachers of the race of the people who are in the majority within its walls. To-day there in my vindication than it originally had, I is no longer pipe (a grant from Congress,) will be equally impersonal. The facts, as I and oh, to what an awful dance is the negro shall state them, are not gleaned from any treated! In mid winter no fire, and in the face of extravagant bills for fuel, students are from personal knowledge. In addition, I told if they want heat, carry the water themselves to the boiler. Two of their best teachere removed-one because she is too familiar with the colored people, and for this reason is snubbed by her white associate teachers,

he is said to be incompetent to teach colored

people although fully competent to teach

white, meaning he is too learned. I can

back this up by affidavit. I know I ask you

a great deal to believe all this, but it is all true, and if placed upon the list of investigations, much will be found rotten in Denmark Pardon me for my digression. A national school, built upon the granite basis of equality is doubtless one of our great needs. One designed for the education of our composite nationality. We are among the nations of the earth a singularly great nation, being comprised nearly of all others. This makes our need great and diversified. A national school should be one fitted to meet all the wants of human civilization. In such, not only the general branches of education would be taught, but all the professions, arts, and sciences, trades, and a systematic knowledge of every human occupation practiced among civilized nations. It is the interval between the graduation at college and the entering some other seminary, for the profession, or the workshop for the trade, that causes us to have so many young men of no position, object, or pursuit. Let us illustrate. A school n which the seven-year boy or girl may enter to receive a liberal education or study classics. mathematics, and the living languages, and at the close of this, have the opportunity to receive, within the same walls, further instructions in whatever pursuit he or she may select. We will begin at the lowest order of things so-called. If to be a washwoman, a proper knowledge of the action of the sun in bleaching certain things placed under its nfluence. If to be a cook, as almost all women are in some degree, then a proper knowledge of all that pertain to culinary science-neatness, cleanliness, and order, never excluded. And so on in this line. Now as to men. Let the school be such, that (to be short) whatever you desire to learn, you can be instructed in, where those who have had to do with your early training, can best impart to you. Let manufactories of every description stud its broad acres; let there be knowledge; schools of politics-in short, a nation within itself. What a source of great riches such an institution would be to a country, can only be understood by practical efforts of the same. Persons having such an institution would no longer have to spend six years in the outside world to know of the things of practical utility. There would be no monotonous, book-worms, and the Hebrew scholar and nothing else; but instead we should have the farmer-a compound-knowing his Greek roots and his potato roots with like efficiency. At some other time I will con-

tinue my views on this subject. Concerning Life and Death.

By the kindness of a friend we have been allowed to compare the statistics of the "life and death rate of Europe and America," and we find great cause for congratulation that our lot has been east in so fortunate a counour tot has been east in so fortunate a country as America. From these tables we learn that the number of deaths in Europe each year is one out of every forty-two inhabitants, or two and thirty-eight one hundredths per cent.; while in the United States there is but one death in every eighty-one inhabitants, or one and twenty-three one hundredths per cent. The most populous of the European nations have the death rate as follows:

England.....1 death to every Prussia...... death to ever

Inhabitants

sas are one to every forty-nine, while in Oregon there is but one death in every two hundred persons. We give the following table as illustrating the death rates in different States: New England States.....l in Middle States.....l

Southern States.....l in 70 Pacific States.....l in 115

longevity America is far superior to any of the older nations of Europe.

their own industry, and to the ruinous consequences to the business of the country by continually tampering with and unsettling the policy of the Government in regard to the duty on imports, and then said:

There are unmistakable indications, he ever, not only on the floor of this House, but in the leading free trade newspapers of the country, that an effort is to be made in this Congress, under the pretense of revenue reform, to overthrow our protective policy, and to build upon its ruins a system of free trade, which will bring the American laborer, and all the industrial interests of the country into competition with the cheap labor, great mancompetition with the cream labor, great manufacturing establishments, and enormous capital of Europe. The enemies of the protective policy commenced their operations at the last session of Congress by a ferocious on-slaught upon the duty as alt and bituminous coal, and have ever since been employed in a zealous and systematic effort to reison the zealous and systematic effort to poison the public mind against all duties which discrim-inate in favor of American industry. Three times at least in the last sixty years

have they succeeded in destroying a protective tariff which had revived our trade and commerce, created a demand for labor, and re merce, created a demand for moor, and restored general prosperity to the country; and each time has this victory of British capitalists brought ruin to our industry. And what was gained to the people of the United States by this ruinous policy? Could we buy foreign goods cheaper? It is true that for a short time our British rivals sold their fabries cheaper than we could neak them. But when cheaper than we could make them; but when they had broken down all competition here by underselling our manufactures, and had thus got control of our market, they at once put their goods up to a higher price than the American article had ever been, and thus compensated themselves for the sacrifice it had cost them to destroy our manufactures. This has been the unvarying result of the policy of free trade in the past, and it will be the result in the future if we adopt that policy

trade that under our present system of dis-criminating in favor of American industry trade is prosperous, that manufactures are flourishing, and that labor is in demand and commands an adequate reward. It does not matter to them that we have a home market, reated by our manufacturing interests, for \$450,000,000 of our agricultural products at \$400,000,000 of our agricultural products at remunerative prices. It does not matter to them that the progress of the country since the adoption of the present policy eleven years ago has been more rapid in spite of the war than during any other period in our history. It does not matter to them that we have been enabled to pay the great burdens of taxations which that war imposed upon us, and to extinguish our national debt at a rate unprecedented in the history of the world, or that the people are contented, prosperous, and happy. All these facts seem to weigh nothing with the men who are bent on this new free trade and anti-American experiment They have resolved to force it upon the They have resolved to force it upon the country at whatever risk to its welfare and however destructive it may be to the interests

WHAT IS FREE TRADE? solute free trade in its real sense—whic is the ultimate aim of all opponents to American industry—means a repeal of duties upor every class of foreign imports, the abolition of our custom-house system, and the opening of our ports to the introduction of the pro-ducts of all nations without fee or charge of any kind. This policy would bring the enor-mous capital and cheap labor of Europe in direct competition with our own industry, and result in the entire destruction of our manu-facturing interests, whether of iron weap or facturing interests, whether of iron, wool of cotton. By this overthrow of our manufac cotton. By this overthrow of our manufac-tures, two million workingmen now profitably employed in them would be thrown out of employment, and the ten million five hundred thousand people now supported by their labor deprived of the means of subsistence or compelled to accept European pauper-labor wages In ten years there would not be a furnace rolling-mill, cotton or woolen factory, or an in existence in all the land. With labor at third the price it commands in the United States, and the control of the vast capital which long years of protection has embled them to accumulate, English, French, and German manufacturers could undersell our own to such an extent as to drive them eve from their own market, and, much more, from those of foreign nations, where we are just be-ginning to gain a foothold. I can scarcely imagine a greater calamity possible to ou country generally, and especially to those en gaged in our various manufactures, and sup-porting at least one-fourth of our whole popu-lation, than the consequences which would inevitably follow the establishment of free trade as the settled policy of the country.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROTECTION AND

The relative influence of protection and fre trade upon the industry of the country may be summed up in a few words. The effect of protection is to stimulate industry and lead to prosperity; of free trade, to ruin most of the great interests of the country. The mis-sion of the one is to build up, of the other to break down. Protection creates a demand for labor and secures it an adequate reward; free trade is designed to lessen that deman and diminish the price of wages. Protection opens mines, erects furnaces, establishes ounderies, starts cotton mills, and gives employment to thousands; free trade shuts up the mines, puts out the fires in the furnaces, si-lences the trip-hammers, arrests the spindles, and drives the thousands either into less profitable pursuits or deprives them altogether of labor. Protection creates home markets, and free trade destroys them. Protection secures and increases industry; free trade di-minishes it. Protection secures good wages; free trade makes them cheap. Protection leads to individual and national self-reliance and independence; free trade makes us de-pendent as individuals and a nation upor

HOW THE TARIFF AFFECTS PRICES. The strongest and almost the only argu-The strongest and annost the only ment used by free trade theorists against a protective tariff is the allegation that it increases the price of every article upon which it is levied just to the extent of such tariff. I concede this to be true in respect to all articles not produced in this country, such as tea, coffee, spices, and the like; but I deny the assertion when applied to such articles as are assertion when applied to such articles as are successfully produced here. According to the free trade theory, if the tariff on broadcloth be two dollars a yard, it makes every yard of broadcloth manufactured in the United States of the same quality just two dollars dearer than it would be otherwise. This, they allege, is the tax which the American consumer is compelled to pay to American manufacturers for their sole benefit. Every man's common sense will tell him that this whole theory that the consumer and not the foreign immon sense will tell him that this whole theory that the consumer and not the foreign im-porter pays this duty on foreign products is unsound and false. I might adduce a thouunsound and false. I might adduce a thou-sand examples to show the practical truth of the doctrine I maintain, for it can be demon-strated by the history of almost any article that we are able to make, and which has been protected by an adequate duty.

I will refer to a few examples. Before the manufacture of window-plass, was producted.

manufacture of window-glass was protected it cost the consumer twelve dollars a box. A heavy duty was laid upon it by the tariff of 1842, (which, according to the free trade theory, ought largely to have increased its

owners with all their force, each seeking his own profit and all free to make and sell it as they could, when the astonishing power of competition soon effected this great reduction in price.

In 1844 the duty on English common bar iron was twenty-five dollars per ton or sixty-cight per cent., and its price was then \$61.83 per ton. In 1846 the duty was lowered to thirty per cent., and in 1857 to twenty-five dollars a ton, and the produced to thirty per cent. according to the free trade theory the result of this reduction of the tariff should have been to reduce the price of iron just to the fact is quite different, as the following comparison will prove: in 1844, as we have seen, the duty on English bar iron was twenty-five dollars a ton, and the prime cost was \$3.83. In 1846 the duty was reduced to thirty per cent., on the thirty per cent, on the duty of \$10.42 per ton, instead of this the cost of producing as ton \$2.83, less the \$410.42 duty, if the free traders are right in their theories. But instead of this the cost of producin actually increased to \$54.80 per ton, an advance of \$17.97 per ton. to \$54.80 per ton, an advance of \$17.97 per

ton.

The article of lead furnishes another strik ing instance of the absolute fallacy of the free trade doctrine. The duty upon lead in 1845, under the tariff of 1842, was three dol-1845, under the tariff of 1842, was three dol-lars per one hundred pounds, and the price in the New York market during that year was \$3.37½ per one hundred pounds. If gen-tlemen are right, the price of lead should have been only thirty-seven and a half cents per one hundred pounds, less than four mills per pound. But when this duty of three dollars was removed and a revenue duty of twenty per cent., or seven and a half cents per one hundred pounds, placed on it, the price, so far fromgoing pown to thirty-seven per one hundred pounds, placed on it, the price, so far fromgoing pown to thirty-seven and a half cents with this duty of seven and a half cents added, absolutely rose between 1847 and 1857, to an average of \$5.67 per one hundred pounds. In other words, when the duty was reduced to one-fortieth of the former rate, the price nearly doubled.

I will give another instance of a more recent date, and of a still more striking characteristics.

cent date, and of a still more striking char-acter. It is the history of three years' expe-rience in the manufacture of steel railroad bars. In 1864 the first steel rails were imbars. In 1804 the first steel rails were imported into the United States. They were sold to our railroad companies that year for a price beginning with \$164 per ton, and gradually decreasing to \$135. The manufacture of the state of the sta States in 1867. The foreign rails at once went to \$115 and then to \$110 per ton. In April, 1870, the price was reduced to \$72 per on, a decrease and saving to railroad companies of more than seventy-five dollars per ton, the result of protection to American steel manufacturers, and the competition it steel manufacturers, and the competition it gave them the means of making with the

English manufacturers.
As further proof in support of my position, I present the following table furnished to Hon. David A. Wells by A. T. Stewart, of New York, both free traders, showing the prices of certain articles under the low tariff of 1860 and the tariff of 1869. It was made of our workingmen. I warn them here and now that for all this they will sooner or later be brought into judgment by the people.

- 1	1040	* ***	per one hundred pounds is equivalent
	1860.	1869.	
.	Cadet cloths,		cents and four mills on the quantity
h	Government		in commerce as a barrel of salt contain
-	standard \$2 75	83 25	hundred and eighty pounds, being five
1	Harris [Ed.] cas-		bushels of fifty-six pounds each. On
	simeres, 14		sacks it is twenty-four cents per one l
	ounces 1 371@\$1 50	1 75@\$2 00	pounds, but the additional six cents
	Cotton warp	1 100042 00	duty on the sack and not on the salt
f	cloths, 14 oz 1 00 @ 1 25	1 75	being no other duty on a sack containing
	All-wool cloths,	1 10	I read from an affidavit made by San
-1		0.75	St. John, a highly respectable merch
1	14 oz 1 50	2 75	New York city, sworn to on the
Ц	Middle sackings. 1 10	1 25	
1	Middlesex doe-		February, 1872, and presented to th
	skins 1 05	1 15	mittee of Ways and Means, for the I
.	Middlesex		of showing the ad valorem duty at
	shawls 7 00	7 00	valuation of the better kinds of foreig
	Middlesex	10 100	"I further state that the present d
	beavers 3 75	4 25	foreign salt, of eighteen cents per on
	Middlesex opera	1 -0	dred pounds, is equivalent only to an
-1	flannels 47½	50	lorem duty on the better kinds of foreig
1	Broadbrook cas-	00	as follows : on Ashton salt, foreign va
			about thirty-seven per cent., valuation
Н	simeres 1 62½@ 1 75	1 75	to the importer in New York, about
ч	Broadbrook bea-	-	per cent.; on Marshall's and other fin
9	vers 2 75	3 00	
Я	Spring cassi-		salt, foreign valuation about fifty-ty
	meres, 8 to 9		cent., valuation or cost in New York
	ounces 1 12½(@ 1 25	1 25(0) 1 36}	thirty-nine per cent. Of these kinds
l	Glenham repel-		the annual importation is from two
ı	lants 1 10 @ 1 15	1 20	five hundred thousand to three million
	Glenham sack-	- T	els, nearly one quarter of the total imp
1	ings 1 05	1 15	foreign salt into the United States."
	Swift River fan-	1 10	Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the
			that the duty upon salt cannot be con-
-1	cies, 11 to 12	1 0000 1 10	as above the necessity standard and as
	ounces 90	1 00@ 1 10	comparison with the duties imposed
1	Royalston cassi-		other imported goods.
٠	meres, aver-	4 744	The salt manufacturers of the United
-1	age 1 07½	1 25	
- 1	Fitchburg cassi-		have been denounced over and over a
П	meres, aver-		greedy monopolists, and the import of
410	2021	4 4.	salt as a crime against civilization T

trade year of 1860.

I will give still another illustration. For instance, the import duties on butter imported from Canada in 1870 amounted to \$163,500 from Canada in 1870 amounted to \$163,500 in gold. Before selling it the Canadian farmer was compelled to go to our custom-house at Detroit, or Oswego, or Portland, and pay to the collector five cents a pound duty. He then sells it, say, for thirty cents a pound, the same price our own farmers are receiving for butter. When the Canadian farmer reached home he had just five cents a pound less for all the butter he sold than the American farmer say to the same price our own farmers are receiving for butter. all the butter he sold than the American farmer had who went to the same market the same day. Did the consumer pay that five cents a pound, or the Canadian farmer from whom the collector exacted it?

PROTECTION TO AGRICULTURISTS. As the American farmer belongs to the mos numerous industrial class of our people, the advocates of free trade have directed their efforts to arousing his prejudices and organizing his opposition to the doctrine of protection to American labor. In their labors to accomhis opposition to the doctrine of protection to American labor. In their labors to accom-plish this purpose they deny that there is any protection afforded by the laws of the country to our agricultural products. The following table will show the duty imposed by the pres-ent tariff upon some of the leading agricul-

tion among our own citizens. Those already in this field of industrial enterprise have no advantage over their fellow-countrymen, except that of prior organization, skill, experience, and established patronage. This advantage, however, is nothing more than belongs to every other pursuit.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a sharp competition among the domestic producers of salt, as the facts will prove. The salt produced in the United States annually is about 20,000,000 bushels. Of this the Onondaga Salt Company supplies 8,500,000 bushels; Michigan supplies 4,000,000; Ohio and West Virginia supply 6,000,000 bushels; and the balance of 1,500,000 bushels is supplied by small works in other parts of the country. This shows a competition among the domestic producers. But in addition to all this we have a sharp foreign competition. More than one-third of the salt consumed in the United States is supplied by foreign companies notwithstanding the present tariff. The annual consumption of salt in Wheat, 20 cents per bushel; corn, 10 cents per bushel; butter and cheese, 25 per cent.; hay, 83 per ton; live stock, 20 per cent.; potatoes, 25 cents per bushel; wool, 10 cents per pound and 11 per cent. ad valorem; oats, 10 cents per bushel.

But the American farmer is benefited by

But the American farmer is benefited by protective tariff in another way. The best customers of the farmer are those industrial centers which our tariff laws have started into centers which our tariff laws have started into life. As the workmen employed in these factories and workshops receive by the operation of the tariff higher wages they can afford to pay, and do pay to the farmer, much higher prices for his produce than he would otherwise secure, and besides are larger purchasers from him. If we compare the prices of farm produce at our manufacturing or mining towns and the quantities consumed by workmen and their families with the prices and quantities of similar places in England, it will be found that the American farmer is largely benefited by the tariff. The home market is the best market, as every farmer well understands.

duty on salt is odious and very burdensome to the people. Let us see what this enor-mous burden is. The average annual con-sumption of salt in the United States is about

\$2.50 a year in advance. 5 Copies for \$10.

upon us their earnest petitions remonstrating against a change in this policy. It is said that if protection is extended to

any particular branch of business it thereby creates a "monopoly." The advocates of free trade forget that it is labor which we aim to protect. The channels of labor and trade

SALT.

porters of foreign salt have been unscrupulou in both their assertions and their figures, and in both their assertions and their figures, and have succeeded in creating an intense preju-

producers of the article.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to briefly refer to some of the charges thus made, and to show their falsity. It is said that the salt manufacturers of the United States are a parcel of grasping monopolists. Nothing is more repulsive to the American mind than the idea

of monopoly. But is salt manufacturing a monopoly? Salt in some form, either as sa-line waters or crude mineral, is found in every

one of our States and Territories, and never has been sought in vain in any of these localities. Throughout the interior various springs, lakes, and pools hold it in copious solution. Indeed, the supply seems to be universal and inexhaustible, not only in the United States, but in all parts of the known world. Our salt manufacturers do not en-

world. Our salt manufacturers do not en

gross and control these stupendous resources nor is it in the nature of things that the should be able to do so. No law, either Stat

dice in the public mind against the dor

roducers of the article.

ne against civilization. The in

RATES OF ADVERTISING. TRANSIENT ADVERTISING RATES:

The space of ten lines Brevier type constitutes an adversing square in this paper.

Any space less than ten lines is charged the rate of a full quare.
All advertisements occupying less than a quarter of a col-inna are computed by the square.
Advertisements inserted for a less time than three months are charged transient rates.

forty-four pounds to each person per capita. This includes all the salt used, whether for household purposes or manufacturing. The average price of a barrel of salt in the different markets of the United States is two doined that the salt of the salt of salt capitals the lars, and as a barrel of salt contains two hundred and eighty pounds, it follows that the cost of salt to each person yearly is thirty-one cents and four mills. Now, conceding that the consumer pays the duty upon salt, let us see what this burdensome tax is. The amount of revenue derived by the Livity

The stranger against the manufacturers of salt at Syracuse that they are making enormous profits. A circular issued by the Free Trade League alleges that the tariff annually puts \$10,000,000 into the pockets of American salt producers. But the truth is they sell annually only twenty million bushels, or four million barnels, at a price not exceeding four million barrels, at a price not exceeding two dollars a barrel, making their gross re-ceipts only \$8,000,000; that is \$2,000,000 less than the Free Trade League tells us are tho annual profits of the salt monopolists of the United States.

to protect. The channels of labor and trade are open to all, and there is no such thing as an industrial monopoly in the United States, The success of one man stimulates others to embark in the same industry, and every additional factory, furnace, or workshop increases the demand for labor, while competition keeps prices within reasonable bounds. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact which cannot be denied that when our workingmen find steady employment, with good wages, the whole country is prosperous. The farmer finds a ready market for the produce of his farm, the trade of the merchant is profitable and brisk, and professional men are promptly paid for But, Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for me to consume the time of the House by ex-posing the falsehoods resorted to by the enemics of protection in relation to the duties on salt. The real question to be decided by this House is, whether salt, like other industrial interests of the United States, shall continue trade of the merchant is promitine and press, and professional men are promptly paid for their services. In prosperous times house-building and other improvements are required, and our builders, carpenters, bricklayers, and to receive the fostering aid of Government, It is estimated by competent authority that the amount of fixed capital invested in the manufacture of salt in the United States is, in round numbers, \$15,000,000. It is a pecu-liarity of this property that it depreciates other trades find quick and profitable employment. But let the depression come, as it will with the repeal of those laws protecting the industrial interests of the country, and how suddenly the demand for this class of narriy of this property that it depreciates rapidly from use, and even more when lying idle. To be kept in good operative order it requires a system of constant partial renewal. A few years of compulsory disuse would destroy the largest part of its value. Yet the enemies of protection propose by the repeal of the duty on salt to put in jeopardy the whole of this investment, much of which its labor slackens, and followed also by the diminution of the wages of labor. I ask the indulgence of the House, Mr. I ask the indulgence of the House, Mr. Speaker, while I present some reasons why the present duty on foreign salt should not be reduced. A portion of my constituents are manufacturers of salt; they have invested their manufacturers of salt; owners have made upon the invitation and encouragement contained in the tariff legis-lation of 1861 and since.

If it be said that the producers of American capital in the enterprise; the business gives emyloyment to five thousand laborers, all of whom receive fair prices for their labor, and although I have no interest whatever in the alt can stand a considerable reduction of the duty upon that article, and yet continue the business, I reply that those who entertain that belief are laboring under a delusion. I that belief are laboring under a delusion. I here assert what I most religiously believe, that any material reduction of the duty will compel the domestic producers to close their works and discharge the fifteen thousand men who now find steady and profitable employment in the manufacture of salt. They are not only exposed to competition from salt brought here from Liverpool and Turk's Island, but also from Goderich. The salt resources of Goderich are ample to furnish the whole United States and the whole world. Salt is produced there with cheap labor and fuel at eighty-five cents per barrel. Transportation, as we are informed, will cost only from ten to forty cents to all the lake ports in the United States. Withdraw the protection which the duty on manufacture of salt, I cannot but feel a deep interest in the question. In behalf, therefore of this great body of meritorious citizens, ask for such continued protection of salt a will secure them steady employment and re will secure them steady employment and re-numerative wages.

The present duty upon salt is as follows: on salt in bulk, and on all rock salt or mineral salt, eighteen cents per one hundred pounds; on salt in sacks twenty-four cents per one hundred pounds. The duty of eighteen cents per one hundred pounds is equivalent to lifty cents and four mills on the quantity known in commerce as a barrel of salt containing two hundred and eighty pounds, being five statute undred and eighty pounds, being five statute ushels of fifty-six pounds each. On salt in tecks it is twenty-four cents per one hundred bunds, but the additional six cents is the Withdraw the protection which the duty on salt affords the American producer, and the time will soon arrive when American salt must yield the markets of the United States aty on the sack and not on the salt, there ing no other duty on a sack containing salt, there in go other duty on a sack containing salt, read from an affidavit made by Samuel R. John, a highly respectable merchant of

I need not ask the House whether it is the I need not ask the House whether it is the true policy of the United States to rely upon other countries for our supply of salt. We may not always remain at peace. We have been involved in four wars within the past century, and may be involved in as many more during the next. If the coming of war should find the property of the transfer of the same property of the t. John, a highly respectable merchant of few York city, sworn to on the 6th of bebruary, 1872, and presented to the Com-nitite of Ways and Means, for the purpose f showing the ad velorem duty at foreign aluation of the better kinds of foreign salt: "I further state that the present duty on preign salt of eightheen cents per one hunfind us buying our salt abroad instead of mak-ing it at home, we cannot expect to escape the panic and distress, the high prices and priva-tions which on that account were precipitated bout thirty-seven per cent., valuation or cost of the importer in New York, about thirty er cent.; on Marshall's and other fine sack alt, foreign valuation about fifty-two per ent., valuation or cost in New York about thirty in the presence of a great demand, would take from the pockets of the people far more than the protective birty-nipe per cent. of a great demand, would take from the pockets of the people far more than the protective duty sufficient to establish and maintain an ample supply of home-made salt, besides gaining the employment which the domestic industries would afford to domestic labor. Had the North, in our civil struggle, been as destitute as the South was of salt manufactories, her population would have suffered even more severely than they did, both in purse and privation. The possession of the much-maligned salt-works at Syracuse is all that saved a large alt-works at Syracuse is all that saved a large ection of the North from all the miseries of salt famine of some continuance. Is it worth while for the people of this country to run the

risk of a like contingency for the pairry con-sideration, spurious in its supposed realities, of saving three cents and one mill per year to each person?

Mr. Speaker, I feel a great interest as to how wool shall be cared for in any revision of the tariff which may take place. A portion of my constituents are largely engaged in the wool-growing business, and they are looking with much anxiety to see what action Con gress may take in the premises. I hope the present duty upon wool will not be disturbed, for I believe it is well adapted to promote the growth and development of wool-growing, and also the interests of consumers, and the public revenue. The growth of wool in this country is of national importance, and no industrial interest is more entitled to the protection and fostering care of the Government.

The present duty upon wool, enacted in The present duty upon wool, enacted in 1867, was assented to by the woolen manufacturers of the United States, as appears by a letter from Hon. E. B. Bigelow, late president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, dated December, 16, 1871, and addressed to Hon. Henry S. Randall, president of the Wool-Growers' Association of the United States. should be able to do so. No law, either State or national, prohibits anybody from investing his capital or his labor in the making of salt. Senator Chandler, of Michigan, stated in the Senate a few days ago that the best salt lands at Saginaw, Michigan, could be purchased at five dollars per acre! The business, therefore, is open to the freest possible competition among our own citizens. Those already in this field of industrial enterprise have no advantage over their fellow-countrymen, ex-United States.

There are many reasons why the present duty upon wool is necessary. It is an interest worthy of preservation, and must not be dis-turbed. If the manufacturers of woolen goods expect to sustain themselves they must stand side by side with the wool-growers of the country, and not make war upon so important an interest.

Mr. Duell then read from the report of the Mr. Duell then read from the report of the second joint convention of the wool-growers and wool-manufacturers of the United States, at Syracuse, New York, December 20, 1871, made by John L. Hayes, Esq., to that convention, showing the present condition of the wool-growing interest in the United States, and giving many unanswerable reasons why the present tariff upon wool should not be disturbed; and in conclusion said:

not be disturbed; and in conclusion said:

I lay down the proposition that frequent changes of legislation on any subject are mischievous. They argue a want of wisdom, stability, and good judgment in our law-makers, and breed contempt for the authority of their enactments. Frequent changes of laws render it impossible for the people to be familiar with their requirements or to respect them as unchangeable rules of action, demanding their observance; and more injurious than all are changes of that class of laws which affect directly or indirectly their pursuits and occupations. It has been truly said that nothing is more detrimental to the interests of labor than to invite it by legislation into a particular channel, and then to prostrate it by abandoning it to a competition which, owing to circumstances, it cannot endure.

consumed in the United States is 32,000,000 bushels, and of this amount 12,000,000 bushels are supplied by importation. I assert, then, without fear of contradiction, that the present tariff has secured no monopoly to the American pro-